DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 427 JC 750 056

AUTHOR Abel, Emily K.
TITLE Social Equality in Mass Higher Education: Connecticut Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 86p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Campus Planning; College Faculty; *College Planning; Disadvantaged Groups; Educational Environment; *Educational Equality; Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; *Junior Colleges; *Junior College Students; *Minority Groups; Open Enrollment; Political Influences; School Location
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

The rhetoric of the community colleges presents them as democratizing agents, enabling the underprivileged to move upward in society through education. While this is their purpose, the community colleges also aspire to gain acceptance as regular members of the system of higher education. In Connecticut, the image of the community colleges suffers for several reasons: (1) they must compete with university 2-year transfer institutions; (2) they are not allowed to duplicate the technical colleges' role; (3) they are housed in substandard buildings where no courses requiring equipment are possible; (4) their per capita expenditures are the lowest among state institutions. Their role in social equalization is hampered by the desire to approximate 4-year institutions in student body makeup, implying a need to avoid high minority enrollments. The faculty is demoralized by a hierarchical governance structure in which it has no power. High turnover and constant tensions among faculty, administration, and students, and an absence of effective leadership have prevented the colleges from developing a clear sense of purpose. This study, based on statewide research as well as a case study of South Central Community College, casts doubt on whether equal opportunity can be fostered under such conditions. (MJK)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED100427

Social Equality in Mass Higher Education:

Connecticut Community Colleges

Emily K. Abel*
1639 Sunset Avenue
Santa Monica, California
November 1, 1974

JC 750 056

* B.A., Swarthmore College; M.A., Columbia University; Ph.D., University of London

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. CONNECTICUT'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES 6

A. Changing Patterns of College Attendance 6

B. The System of Higher Education 9

C. The Expansion of Community Colleges 13

D. Funding 16

III. SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE 20

A. Racial Minorities 20

B. Policies of the State Government toward South Central 27

1. System of Governance of Higher Education 27

2. South Central's Search for Permanent Facilities 29

C. Internal Organization 37

D. Faculty 39

E. Students 44

F. Curriculum 49

G. Student Careers: Retention, Graduation and Transfer 52

IV. CONCLUSION 57

I. INTRODUCTION

Diversification is one of the means by which the systems of higher education in advanced industrial societies have responded to recent demands for greater access.[1] The United States is distinctive for both the heterogeneity of its post-secondary institutions and the extent to which it has moved toward universal access to higher education. The rapid growth of community colleges, differing from the more established colleges and universities in such significant aspects as admission, tuition and length and type of curriculum, has been one of the most significant structural changes in higher education in the United States in the past decade. Between 1960 and 1970, the total number of community colleges in the country doubled;[2] during the late 1960's, they were established at the rate of one a week.[3] Every state except South Dakota now has some form of community college.[4] The Carnegie Commission estimates that almost 30 percent of all undergraduates and 25 percent of all students in higher education are currently enrolled in a community college and that by 1980 community college students will constitute 35 to 40 percent of all undergraduate students.[5]

This expanding network of community colleges has brought into focus the underlying problem of diversification.

Can there be equality of status among institutions of higher education which differ in the character of their student body, the educational background of their faculty, and the nature of their curriculum? Can a system of higher education offer unstratified variety in its institutions, providing genuine alternatives for different types of students, or do these institutions automatically form a hierarchical structure which corresponds to the social structure of society at large?[6] More immediately, do community colleges function primarily to expand opportunities for a segment of the population which previously did not have access to post-secondary education, or do they serve as selective mechanisms, "sorting out" the students whom higher education does not want?

The rhetoric of the community colleges presents them as democratizing agents, enabling the underprivileged to move upward through education. However, in his classic study of San Jose City College, Burton Clark pointed out that a primary function of a community college is to "cool out" students whose ambitions outstrip their academic achievement. The low tuition and open admissions policies of community colleges extend educational opportunity to students whose financial resources and academic records prevent them from entering other post-secondary institutions. However, community colleges also aspire to gain acceptance as regular members of the system of higher education. Most

traditional four-year colleges and universities are elitist, concerned far more about maintaining standards than about promoting social mobility; they gain status by improving the quality of their faculty, student body and curriculum. The "cooling out" process is the means by which community colleges solve the conflict between the democratic ideal of equal opportunity through education and the academic ideal of the pursuit of excellence. Although two-thirds of all entering community-college students declare their intention to transfer to a four-year college after completing a two-year program, the community college makes certain that only one-third of all entrants succeeds in fulfilling this goal. Through such means as pre-entrance aptitude tests, individual counselling, orientation classes, and probation notices, a large group of students are gradually convinced of their personal inadequacies and diverted into terminal vocational programs. The opaqueness of this screening process protects the democratic aura of the community college; students blame themselves rather than the institution for thwarting their ambitions.[7]

Jerome Karabel has sought to make explicit the socio-economic dimensions of the "cooling-out" process. The community college must carefully screen its students not only because the faculty of traditional four-year post-secondary institutions prefer to educate only highly qualified students but also because the entire American

system of education serves to allocate youth to an ascribed occupational role. Community college freshmen frequently come from low socio-economic backgrounds and hope to move upward in society through education; they wish to obtain the status and pecuniary rewards which they believe a B.A. can confer. However, the educators, foundations and industries who insist that the community colleges emphasize vocational programs are seeking to funnel a large percentage of these ambitious students into relatively low-level occupations. In fact, students who succeed in continuing their education beyond the two years of a community college are generally from a higher socio-economic background than those who are diverted into terminal vocational programs. The "cooling-out" process is thus a form of class-based tracking occurring within the community college. In addition, the community college can itself be considered the lowest track in the system of higher education. The unequal status of community colleges is clearly shown by their low level of funding relative to that of other post-secondary institutions. Moreover, the social composition of the student body is one of the criteria by which the prestige of an institution of higher education is measured; the community college is thus considered second-rate precisely because it admits unselected, lower-class youth.[8] Karabel's point is supported by the fact that, in a number of cities throughout the country,

the students for whom the community colleges have been created are demanding entry instead to the established four-year colleges and universities, claiming that community colleges are, by definition, inferior.

This paper will explore the success of democratization through an analysis of the community college system in Connecticut. It is important [illegible] with this issue within the context of a particular state, for education has traditionally been the responsibility of state governments and public systems of education have therefore developed differently in the various states. A good deal of the literature on community colleges has focused on such "pace-setter" states as California, Florida, and Illinois, and generalizations about the nature of community colleges have frequently been drawn from the experience of these state systems. By contrast, most of the community colleges in Connecticut are relatively new and fragile institutions which have encountered substantial resistance in their attempts to gain recognition and acceptance. By way of background, this paper will deal first with changing trends in college enrollment in Connecticut and with the history and structure of public higher education in the state. The growth of Connecticut's community colleges and the nature of their funding will then be discussed. Finally, the paper will present a case study of South Central Community College, a college in

New Haven which highlights, in a somewhat exaggerated form, the problems of all community colleges in the state.

II. CONNECTICUT'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A. Changing Patterns of College Attendance

Like many wealthy states, Connecticut is also a highly educated state. In 1970, it ranked first in per capita income in the nation and second in the number of Ph.D.s per million population.[9] Eighty-one percent of Connecticut's 18-year-old population completed high school, as opposed to 76 percent for the nation as a whole, and 72 percent of the state's high school graduates attended college, compared with 61 percent for the nation.[10] However, higher education in Connecticut has always served those who can pay for it. Like the rest of the north-east, Connecticut has been a center of private higher education. The state contains twenty-five private colleges, five of which are two-year institutions.[11] In 1968, 19 percent of the state's college freshmen were enrolled in private post-secondary institutions.[12] In addition, an unusually large number of students leave Connecticut to attend college in other states. In 1968, Connecticut had a net debt of 21,125 "out-migrating" students;[13] 42 percent of the residents of Connecticut who were enrolled as

freshmen anywhere were students at "out of state" institutions, compared with 16 percent of the college freshmen in the nation as a whole.[14] It is important to note the different patterns of college attendance in California and Connecticut because the state institutions of higher education in California frequently serve as a model. While the vast majority of California's college freshmen remain in their home state to attend public post-secondary institutions, about two-thirds of Connecticut's student population either attend private institutions in the state or leave Connecticut to further their education.[15]

During the 1960's, the demand for higher education increased rapidly in Connecticut, as it did everywhere in the nation. In fact, this expansion in numbers of potential college applicants is frequently considered to be a cause of the speed with which American community colleges were founded during the decade. Between 1960 and 1970, the number of 18 year-olds in the United States increased 37 percent and the number of high school graduates increased 56 percent.[16] This created a larger cohort demanding entry to the nation's institutions of higher education. The number of high school graduates continuing their education rose 93 percent from 1960 to 1970,[17] and enrollment in post-secondary institutions increased from 3,609,000 to 7,920,000.[18] The proportion of students enrolled in the public sector grew from 50 percent

in 1950 to 67 percent in 1965; the proportion is expected to reach 70 percent in 1980.[19] Connecticut's rate of growth exceeded that for the nation as a whole. Between 1960 and 1970, the number of 18-year-olds increased 42 percent, the number of students completing secondary school rose 57 percent and the number of high school graduates continuing their education in some form of post-secondary institution rose 96 percent.[20] Enrollment in post-secondary institutions in the state rose from 53,800 in the fall of 1960 to 125,680 in the fall of 1970.[21] Moreover, despite the continued importance of private higher education, the number of students in the public sector overtook the number in private post-secondary institutions in 1965.[22] Between 1965 and 1970, the enrollment in the four state colleges increased almost 100 percent.[23]

By 1971, in Connecticut, as elsewhere in the United States, the period of expanding enrollment in higher education appeared to be over. That fall the proportion of high school graduates in Connecticut continuing their education fell by one percent to 71 percent, and the next year the figure had dropped to 66 percent.[24] These figures are particularly significant because the continuation rate of high-school graduates is one of the factors most frequently used to project enrollment trends. Moreover, in 1971 the rate of growth of full-time undergraduate enrollment in Connecticut's post-secondary institutions

began to decline.[25] Institutions which had been created to accommodate the masses seeking admission to higher education in the 1960's suddenly found themselves with a dwindling clientele.

B. The System of Higher Education

In the early 1960's, Connecticut's system of public higher education consisted primarily of a university and four state colleges. The university was founded in Storrs in 1881 as the Storrs Agricultural School, a land grant college.[26] Its successive name changes demonstrate the way in which it was gradually transformed into a selective, multi-purpose university. It was named the Storrs Agricultural College in 1893, Connecticut Agricultural College in 1899, Connecticut State College in 1933 and finally the University of Connecticut in 1939.[27] The university currently consists of 17 schools and colleges. By law it is charged with "exclusive responsibility for programs leading to doctoral degrees."[28] The four state colleges began as normal schools established between 1850 and 1903 in New Haven, New Britain, Willimantic and Danbury. These schools also followed a route parallel to that of comparable institutions in other states, and increasingly tended to model themselves on the more prestigious post-secondary institutions. During the 1930's, when the schools received the privilege of granting the B.A. degree, their newly enhanced status was symbolized by a change of name to

State Teachers Colleges. During the 1960's the institutions added graduate programs and dropped the "Teachers" from their official title. Although teacher training is still their primary function, the state colleges have sought to broaden and diversify their curricula.[29] At the same time, they have tightened their admissions requirements and become, in part, residential colleges. Students are recruited throughout the state and selected on the basis of class rank and entrance examination scores. In 1970, most of the students in the state colleges were in the top 50 or 60 percent of their high school graduating class.[30]

The continual up-grading of the four colleges and the university left room at the base of the academic hierarchy for a new type of institution catering to a less selective clientele and assuming some of the functions which the former normal schools and the land-grant college had shed. In almost every state, community colleges are non-residential two year institutions which charge little or no tuition, have minimal entrance requirements and offer both liberal arts and vocational courses. The first community colleges in Connecticut were established in Norwalk, Manchester and Winsted, by the individual municipalities in the early 1960's. The community college system officially began in 1965 with the passage of Public Act 330. This act, which reorganized the entire public sector of higher education in Connecticut, incorporated the three existing campuses

into a Regional Community College system and provided for the establishment of additional colleges.[31] By 1965, the basic shape of public higher education in Connecticut thus resembled that of many other states in the country. Connecticut has a three-tier system with the university at the apex, the four state colleges in the middle and the more numerous community colleges forming the base of the pyramid.

This structure is complicated to some degree in Connecticut by the existence of two types of public, two-year institutions which operate alongside the community colleges. Connecticut was one of nine states which established a number of lower-level branches of the university.[32] These branches, located at Groton, Hartford, Stamford, Torrington and Waterbury, generally serve students with higher academic capabilities and aspirations than those of the community college entrants. The courses provided at the branch campuses are modelled closely on the first two years of the traditional liberal arts college and graduates are automatically accepted into the upper-division of the Storrs campus.[33] The low enrollment at some of these campuses has caused educators and state officials to raise questions about their continued usefulness.[34]

The technical colleges pose more serious competition for the community colleges. These institutions have their roots in technical high schools which were established during the post-war years in Hartford, Norwich, Waterbury

and Norwalk, and gradually upgraded.[35] Their engineering programs are at a higher level than those found in most of the nation's community colleges and applicants are required to demonstrate considerable sophisitication in science and mathematics.[36] Almost all of their graduates either secure immediate employment in industry or transfer to a four-year college in order to obtain a B.S. degree.[37]

Because the state government is anxious to prevent duplication of costly programs and facilities, the newer community colleges have been prevented from offering the technical courses which provide the core of the vocational curriculum at many "comprehensive" community colleges in the nation.[38] There have recently been a number of suggestions that the technical colleges and community colleges either amalgamate or establish machinery through which they can coordinate their activities. In fact, some reports have recommended that a new technical college, authorized by the state legislature in 1967 for the greater New Haven area, be constructed adjacent to South Central Community College.[39] The technical colleges, however, have expressed strong opposition to any type of merger, and their close relationship with industry has given them a powerful position from which to voice this opinion. Like the four-year institutions which are asked to admit some of the new students knocking at their doors, the technical colleges have warned that the high quality of their programs would

suffer from close affiliation with the low-status community colleges.[40]

C. The Expansion of Community Colleges

The community college system grew rapidly after 1965. In that year three campuses were already in existence; by the end of 1969, ten more had been either established or authorized by the General Assembly.[41] The speed with which the new campuses were launched demonstrated the absence of systematic planning. While state officials and educators opposed inauguration of new campuses before those already operating had been strengthened, politicians vied with each other for the privilege of bringing a community college home to their constituents.[42] Complaints about political interference with community colleges were thus heard at the very beginning of the system. It will be seen that this politicization has lessened their contribution to social equality.

In one respect, however, the haste with which the campuses were created did foster equal opportunity in higher education. Six years after the community college system was established, Connecticut had become "one of the state leaders in the drive toward universal access to higher education."[43] By 1971, Connecticut had twelve community colleges. Despite the state's poor over-all record in public higher education, it had founded community colleges within commuting distance of a greater proportion of its

population than any other state.[44] A small and densely populated state, Connecticut could offer college education to most of its residents with a relatively small number of campuses. Although California had seven times as many colleges categorized as "free access," the state is thirty times as large.[45] Eighty-seven percent of Connecticut's population lived within commuting distance of a "free access" college, as opposed to 60 percent in California and 42 percent in the nation as a whole.[46]

Nevertheless, free access is not the only component of equal opportunity. A state does not automatically redistribute privilege in higher education by moving toward universal access. The significant question is not whether students can find a non-selective, low-tuition college close to home, but whether they can receive an education which meets their needs once they enroll. Does funding permit the college to provide compensatory programs for students with poor academic backgrounds, and adequate vocational courses for students who seek immediate employment? Can students who wish to obtain a B.A. transfer readily from a community college to a four-year college, or are they subject to a "cooling-out" process? Does the community college offer an education which is viewed as intrinsically inferior? These are some of the questions which this paper will try to answer.

The community colleges expanded in size as well as in number during the late 1960's. This was, as we have seen, a period when enrollment rose rapidly throughout the public sector of higher education.[47] However, the community college system was "the major growth unit of higher education."[48] In 1965 the full-time equivalent enrollment of the three community colleges was 1,455; the ten community colleges which were operating by 1970 had a combined full-time equivalent enrollment of 12,198.[50] At least in terms of the size of its student body, the community college system constituted a substantial part of the public sector of higher education by this date. Moreover, it has been estimated that by 1979 the community colleges will contain over a third of the students enrolled in public post-secondary institutions in Connecticut.[51] The quality of public higher education will thus be determined, to a significant extent, by the performance of the community colleges.

However, this expansion has not continued. The community colleges have been affected by the enrollment trends experienced throughout higher education, despite the difference in clientele. After 1971, the number of full-time students at the community colleges began to decline.[52] Some state planners have projected that by 1980 or 1985 each community college will contain from two to five thousand day-time students.[53] However, it is doubtful that more than a few campuses will in fact have such large student

bodies unless the most recent trends are reversed.[54] Enrollment figures for the twelve community colleges in the fall of 1972 are in Table I.

D. Funding

Despite the rapid growth of the community college system after 1965, funding lagged. It was far easier to pass legislation creating new campuses than it was to provide those institutions with sufficient funds. In the absence of more accurate standards, the quality of an educational institution is often measured by its resources. Low per capita expenditures have been the most important problem of each of Connecticut's community colleges. In 1973, a group of educators and prominent citizens who prepared a report for the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut felt compelled to plead that "the open admissions policy at the community colleges be made operative by adequate funding."[55]

In part, the low level of funding for the community colleges results from the fact that public higher education has always been a low priority in Connecticut. In 1970, the state ranked first in per capita income in the nation. However, it ranked forty-seventh both in per capita expenditures for public higher education and in the amount spent for each college-age resident.[56] These figures are particularly striking because the rise in enrollment during the 1960's had been accompanied by markedly increased

expenditures. Appropriations voted by the state legislature for higher education rose from $13.8 million in 1960-61 to $87.8 million in 1970-71.[57] Unfortunately, shortly after most of the new community colleges began operation, this increase in appropriations abruptly ceased. Since 1970, there has been a decline in the support allocated for each student in public higher education.[58]

The low level of support for community colleges can also be attributed to their position at the bottom of the academic hierarchy. As Karabel has pointed out, state governments frequently allocate more money for each student at the more presitigious institutions. In California, for example, "the higher ranking the institution, the more public money spent on the student."[59] This pattern of differential funding is frequently justified by the absence of costly research at the community colleges. However, many educators doubt that a two-year program offering compensatory and vocational courses can operate any more cheaply than the lower-level program of a traditional four-year college. Nevertheless, throughout the nation, community colleges have frequently appeared attractive to legislators precisely because they were billed as an inexpensive means of educating the masses.

Connecticut's community colleges are thus doubly disadvantaged: they are funded at a lower rate than the other units of public post-secondary education by a state

government which has always stinted on money for higher education. The per capita expenditure for each full-time equivalent student is $2,581 at the university, $1,337 at the state colleges and $903 at the community colleges.[60] The Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut compared 1971-72 expenditures per community college student with those of twenty-one other states.[61] The median per capita expenditure for the twenty-two states was $1,363; only one of these states appropriates less for each community college student than does Connecticut.[62] The Master Plan states:[63]

> The per-student support level of Connecticut's regional community colleges parallels that for the state's secondary schools. This would be tenable if it enabled the colleges to offer an adequate spectrum of programs but it does not. The level of operational support has been so low that it has limited the ability of the community colleges to provide preprofessional, terminal paraprofessional and skills programs, even in subject areas that do not require costly laboratories, shops and equipment. The low support level also curtails community service programs. The New England Association of Schools and Colleges has clearly indicated that it cannot continue to accredit some of Connecticut's community colleges unless their support levels and their facilities are improved.

The inadequacy of support for the community colleges is clearly demonstrated by the makeshift facilities at many of the campuses. In turn, these facilities offer the most visible evidence of the low status of community colleges. High schools, old factories, a former shopping center and even the condemned maximum security ward of a state mental hospital have been used as classrooms. A report issued in the fall of 1971 on the status of facilities at eight

community colleges noted that three had no place to hold large meetings, five lacked adequate laboratories and equipment for occupational programs, two had no space for physical education programs, two had no soundproofing between classrooms, four had a serious lack of parking and four had only one room for faculty offices.[64] Students who go to college in such surroundings cannot help but feel that they are receiving a second-rate education.

* * * * * * * * * * *

The discussion up to this point enables us to draw some conclusions about the extent to which Connecticut's community colleges foster social equality in higher education. It is important to remember that some of the problems which the community colleges face result from the newness of the system. Others are common to all public post-secondary institutions in the state; public higher education has traditionally been accorded low priority in Connecticut and neither the state colleges nor the university has become a source of communal pride. Nevertheless, the inadequate funding of all of the community colleges and the makeshift facilities of many make apparent the low position of community colleges in the academic hierarchy. By creating a large number of widely distributed institutions which cater to students previously excluded from higher

education, Connecticut has taken a step toward redistributing educational privilege. However, these new students enter schools clearly demarcated in status from existing post-secondary institutions. The description of an individual community college which follows will permit us to examine the relevance for Connecticut of further elements in the analyses of both Clark and Karabel.

III. SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

There is considerable variation among the twelve community colleges in Connecticut. Despite the problems which have beset the entire community college system, some of the campuses have established a firm reputation. South Central Community College in New Haven, located in the center of the city and enrolling a large minority population, has remained more marginal than any of the other campuses. Although this campus can not be considered representative of the community colleges in the state, it will be examined in depth because it clearly illustrates the tension between democracy and academic prestige.

A. Racial Minorities

It is generally assumed that the extent to which a school fosters social equality is dependent, at least in part, on the ease with which minority students can gain

admission and remain to receive a degree. However, as both Clark and Karabel have pointed out, the composition of the student body is a determinant of status for an institution of higher education. A post-secondary institution gains prestige by acquiring a student body closely resembling that of traditional four-year colleges. If the proportion of minority students is large, that alone is cause for the school to be considered second-rate.

During the late 1960's, numerous campus incidents focused on the issue of race and a primary objective of open-door admissions policies was to provide minority groups with access to higher education. Nevertheless, racial minorities are still greatly underrepresented in American colleges and universities.[65] The racial inequality of Connecticut's system of public higher education has been widely criticized.[66] In fact, the private sector has assumed a larger responsibility for reversing past deprivation than have the state controlled four-year institutions.[67] Between the fall of 1970 and the fall of 1972, the percentage of minority youth among all full-time undergraduate students in Connecticut rose approximately one percent.[68] In four-year private colleges and universities the proportion increased from 5 to 6.8 percent while in the University of Connecticut and the four state colleges, the proportion rose from 4.9 to 6.1 percent.[69] See Table II.

The underrepresentation of Connecticut's minority population in public four-year colleges may stem partly from

the changing demographic composition of the state. In 1960, Connecticut was a predominantly white state, containing only 4.4 percent minority residents. The largest ethnic group were Italians who comprised 24.1 percent of the population. During the 1960's, however, the black and Puerto Rican population of the state more than doubled. In 1970 the State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities estimated that Connecticut's black and Puerto Rican population represented between eight and ten percent of the total.[70] Racial minority communities grew most rapidly in the cities, which whites fled in quest of the suburbs. By the early 1970's, eight cities contained 78 percent of the state's minority residents. The three cities with the largest minority communities were Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven.[71] See Table III.

The location of the state's public four-year colleges is one reason for their inaccessability to Connecticut's non-white residents. The state university is situated in a small town. Neither Hartford nor Bridgeport has a public four year college. But New Haven is the home of Southern Connecticut State College, an obvious school at which graduates of South Central Community College might continue their education. Southern Connecticut, however, has a reputation of being inhospitable to minority students.[72] Despite the recent upgrading of the college, it is still viewed as a school for white, lower middle-class Italian

girls who want to be teachers. Unlike a community college which serves an exclusively local clientele, Southern Connecticut recruits students from all parts of the state; the blacks who live within a few miles of Southern Connecticut do not consider it "their" school. Between the fall of 1970 and the fall of 1972, the total full-time minority enrollment at Southern Connecticut increased by only six students from 171 to 177 while the total full-time enrollment rose from 6,836 to 7,116.[73]

In Connecticut, as in many states in the country, the community colleges contain higher proportions of minority students than the public four-year institutions. The proportion of minority students in all of the regional community colleges in Connecticut rose from 10.1 percent in the fall of 1970 to 11.5 percent in the fall of 1972.[74] While the University of Connecticut and the four state colleges contained a total of 1,187 black or Spanish-surname undergraduates in the fall of 1972, a total of 2,440 minority students were enrolled in the twelve community colleges.[75] The distribution of these students at the different campuses is shown in Table I.

Only two community colleges, South Central and Greater Hartford, contain a sizable proportion of minority students. In view of this, it is significant that the proportion of black and Puerto Rican students at South Central rose between the fall of 1972 and the fall of 1973.[76]

	Enrollment at South Central Community College	
	Fall, 1972	Fall, 1973
Black	447	435
Puerto Rican	30	38
White (and other)	1,166	924
	1,643	1,397

Thus, although the total enrollment declined, the number of minority students remained almost constant and the proportion of black and Puerto Rican students rose from 29 percent to 34 percent. It is dangerous to generalize from statistics of two years. Nevertheless, we can speculate that either blacks and Puerto Ricans had fewer options, or members of minority groups were more determined to attend any college, even if its prestige were falling, or white students were deterred precisely because they saw black and Puerto Rican students becoming a significant element in the student body.

The "Equal Opportunity" report, prepared by a group of educators for the Master Plan in Connecticut, called the community college system the "Entree for Minorities."[77] According to the report, "In Connecticut there has been a recent upspring of the community college system which, in many ways, provides the opportunity for greater accessibility to higher education of the minority student."[78] However, it is far from clear that the establishment of community colleges in this state has actually served to bring minority

groups into the system of higher education. As we have seen, minority students comprise a significant element of the student body at only two community colleges. Both have encountered more difficulties than many of the other community colleges in establishing their reputations. Moreover, there is reason to suspect that at least some educators in the state view the expanding network of community colleges as a "safety-valve," diverting popular demand for places at the more exclusive colleges and universities. The president of a state college in Connecticut commented that his institution need not alter the low proportional representation of blacks in its student body because it would be the responsibility of the newly-founded community colleges to accommodate minority groups.[79] The "Equal Opportunity" report itself issued the warning that "the community colleges must not be "'a dumping ground for minorities.'"[80]

One way of testing whether community colleges serve to side-track students from the regular four-year institutions is by looking at the ease with which community college students can transfer after completing two years' work. As the Preliminary Draft of the Master Plan stated, entry at the level of the community colleges "is limited access unless it leads to further opportunity in upper division and professional schools."[81] The fact that the percentage of full-time black and Puerto Rican students at public colleges and universities remained virtually constant between 1970

and 1972 lends substance to the fears of minority groups that the creation of community colleges does not promote racial equality in the system of higher education as a whole. The reasons why only a tiny fraction of South Central's students have succeeded in continuing their education in a four-year institution will be discussed at a later point. Here it is important to note that the number of minority students transferring from this community college to Southern Connecticut has clearly been far too small to affect the over-all ethnic composition of the student body of the state college.

The proportional representation of minority groups on the professional staff at South Central also makes this college an unusual post-secondary institution in Connecticut. As Tables IV and V show, in the fall of 1972, the college employed more minority administrators than all of the other community colleges combined. Moreover, although the administrative staff at the college constituted only .05 percent of the administrators in the entire system of higher education, 20 percent of all minority administrators in the system were employed at South Central.[82] Twenty-six percent of all full-time faculty at the college were members of racial minority groups. This was a far higher proportion than at any other unit of public post-secondary education in the state.[83]

B. Policies of the State Government toward South Central

1. System of Governance of Higher Education

South Central is thus an important college to study because minorities are unusually well represented both on the professional staff and in the student body. We can assume that if the system of higher education in Connecticut held the interests of minorities paramount, South Central would receive some type of preferential treatment. In fact, the reverse appears to be the case. Before examining the policies of the central governing boards toward the college, it is necessary to outline the pattern of control of Connecticut's community colleges.

Connecticut is one of twelve states in which the state government has assumed full responsibility for all community colleges.[84] Public Act 330, which established the state system of community colleges in 1965, created a Board of Trustees to govern the three community colleges already in existence and all additional institutions of this type.[85] The Board consists of twelve members, appointed by the governor for six-year terms. They are responsible for making all major policy decisions and for selecting the president of each college. As in many states in which control of community colleges is centralized, local municipalities do not contribute to the support of these colleges.[86] Tuition received by each of the community colleges goes into a general fund and is redistributed by

the state government. Thus, although the very term community college implies a link between the institution and the neighborhood it serves, in Connecticut the community has little control over the affairs of a community college. The Board of Trustees does appoint a regional council for each of the twelve campuses, but the councils are without real power.[87] Lacking authority to participate in policy decisions, the councils function primarily to promote public relations and to raise supplemental funds.

Public Act 330 also provided for the creation of a central organizing and planning body, the Commission for Higher Education, responsible for coordinating the governing boards of the university, the state colleges, the community colleges and the technical colleges. The duties of the Commission include review of the budget, approval of programs, sites, tuition and salary changes, and responsibility for long-range planning. The Commission is composed of seventeen members, including the Commissioner for Education who serves as an ex officio member. One member is elected by the Board of Trustees for each of the constituent units, and twelve are appointed by the governor for eight-year terms.[88]

In February, 1973, there was one member of a minority group on the Commission for Higher Education and one on the Board of Trustees.[89] However, the minority representative on the Board of Trustees resigned in the

fall of 1973.[90] The "Equal Opportunity" report stated:

> With but one or two exceptions, the plight of minorities results from the formal structure of higher education. While the structure does not disallow the involvement of minorities, neither does it encourage their involvement on every level . . . .
>
> The entire structure--including the Governor's office, State Legislature, the Commission for Higher Education, and the Boards of Trustees, and the institutions themselves--reflects marginal input from minorities. The inclusion of one minority person, who would not have the mechanism to communicate with the broader minority community, is inadequate for reasonable representation of the community and its needs.[91]

However, the low priority accorded to the interests of minority groups in higher education appears to stem not only from the unequal representation of minorities on the governing and coordinating boards but also from the high degree of political intrusion in the system as a whole. The Board of Trustees, in fact, seems to serve as an entry-way rather than as a buffer for political forces. In Connecticut, minority groups have almost no power on the state level; politicization of the system of higher education thus entails continued discrimination against blacks and Puerto Ricans. As the tortuous history of selecting a permanent site for South Central Community College illustrates, this college has become a pawn in the political process.

2. South Central's Search for Permanent Facilities

When the college opened in 1968 in New Haven, it held classes in a high school and used a pre-World War I armory located nearby for administrative and faculty offices.

In 1969, the President of the college wrote, "The physical conditions in which the College's personnel and students must live [sic] and function is the most deplorable inadequacy of the institution."[92] In the spring of 1970, the college transferred its administrative offices to a former mansion about half a mile away. In the fall of 1973, the armory was condemned and some of the offices remaining in it were moved to a community center a mile away.[93]

Nevertheless, the major problems remained. The lack of a central campus exacerbated the difficulties of communication which observers have noted at the college.[94] Although it has been customary throughout the country for community colleges to be established, at least temporarily, in facilities which were shared with a high school, the disadvantages of this arrangement have frequently been noted.[95] Classes can meet only when the high school is not in session, during the late afternoon and evening. In a report commissioned by the Board of Trustees, the Arthur D. Little Company wrote:[96]

> A positive image to engender community pride and respectability is essential to effectiveness. . . . Most destructive of a positive image is to temporarily house a community college operation in a high school which is being used simultaneously by the secondary school.

In addition, the college has use of only three laboratories, none of which is appropriate for vocational programs requiring equipment.[97] It is largely for this reason that

liberal arts and business courses have formed the core of the curriculum. The classrooms, moreover, are seriously overcrowded. In June, 1972, the accreditation committee of the Commission for Higher Education wrote,

> As long as the college remains at the present site it is doubtful it will ever be able to offer a program which will be commendably representative of what a college should be providing for students who are seeking preparation for becoming constructive participants in modern complex society.[98]

The following year the regional accrediting association, the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, threatened to remove even the conditional accreditation of the college unless it moved to a permanent and more suitable location by June 30, 1974.[99]

Although South Central is not the only community college which began operation in makeshift and inadequate facilities, it has encountered greater difficulties than the other colleges in finding a suitable site for a permanent campus. The quest began almost immediately after the college opened. Since then, the college officials have considered over nineteen possible sites.[100] The Preliminary Draft of the Master Plan describes the way in which college sites are supposed to be selected in Connecticut:[101]

> At present, the process of developing higher education facilities begins at the institutional level. The constituent units identify their facilities needs and submit their project proposals to the trustees for evaluation and approval within the yearly capital budget.
>
> Subsequent to this approval, the request is forwarded to two separate agencies of the state

> government (1) the Budget Office (representing the Executive Branch), and (2) the Commission for Higher Education (CHE). The Commission reviews and recommends on a priority basis. The Budget Office, in consultation with the Public Works Department, provides information upon which the Governor can base his own capital budget request.

On April 17, 1972, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution authorizing the lease of 50,000 square feet of the factory belonging to the Seamless Rubber Company, located on the edge of a black community, in New Haven.[102] The Commission for Higher Education approved this recommendation in June.[103] However, the following September, the local paper reported that the state was considering constructing a college on a former rifle range, which belonged to the state, in East Haven.[104] In January, 1973, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution reaffirming its original choice of the Seamless Rubber Company but the Board also stated that it would consider the East Haven site under certain conditions.[105] At the same time, statements expressing strong disapproval of the latter site began to be issued. Within a few months, the majority of the students and faculty at the college, the local advisory board, local legislators, the Mayor of New Haven and such community groups as the local chapter of the NAACP and the Black Coalition had voiced their opposition to the proposal.[106] Their arguments were first, that the East Haven rifle range is located 4.7 miles from the center of New Haven and, since the site is not served by reliable public transportation, it is inaccessible to many inner-city residents.[107]

A study conducted under the auspices of the Board of Trustees showed that the majority of students attending the college lived in New Haven or areas to the west or north; only a small percentage of the students were residents of towns east of New Haven.[108] The second argument against moving the college to East Haven was that the town had a reputation of being inhospitable to blacks and was thus a poor choice for a college in which minority groups constituted a sizable element of the student body.

It was also charged that the proposal to construct a community college campus in East Haven was essentially a political move.[109] Thomas J. Meskill, a Republican Governor, wished to perform a favor for Frank Messina, the Republican Mayor of East Haven; the Mayor of New Haven, Batholomew Guida, is a Democrat. Messina wanted the college to be located on the rifle range in order to prevent a proposed jail from being constructed on the site and to have the surrounding land improved by the state.[110] During his campaign for governor, Meskill had promised the residents of East Haven that a jail would not be built on the rifle range.[111] East Haven officials claimed that bus transportation could be provided to the rifle range, that it would provide more "bucolic" surroundings than a renovated factory and that the college would add a "cultural element" to the town. Moreover, a college located in East Haven would serve "all" students, not just minorities, and would

thus have a better reputation.[112]

In March, 1973, the Board of Trustees reaffirmed its original choice of the Seamless Rubber Company and removed any other alternatives from consideration.[113] However, the local New Haven paper stated that the proposal to use this factory was being held up in the State Department of Public Works.[114] New Haven legislators and community leaders noted that the Acting Commissioner of this Department, Paul Manafort, was a former mayor of New Britain, Governor Meskill's home town, and that he had been appointed to his present position by the Governor.[115] The following month, Meskill stated that he would veto any agreement between the state and the Seamless Rubber Company.[116] In May, the Regional Advisory Committee and the college officials sought to circumvent some of the Governor's objections to the factory by proposing a new site in New Haven, property owned by the Blakeslee-Gant combine, a major company, in a developing industrial area, adjacent to a black neighborhood and on a bus route.[117] At its meeting on May 19, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution authorizing the lease or purchase of this property as a "satellite" campus for the college.[118] Observers claimed that this action implied that the Board, despite its former approval of the New Haven site, had decided that the college would be located in East Haven.[119] In addition community groups in New Haven argued that the "satellite concept"

would result in segregation. Blacks would attend the inner-city branch campus, which would offer primarily remedial courses, while the student body at the central East Haven campus would be almost exclusively white.[120] At a meeting on June 15, the Commission for Higher Education also opposed the proposal for a satellite campus and expressed its firm support for a permanent facility in New Haven.[121]

Nevertheless, on June 18, the Board of Trustees passed two resolutions, one stating that the East Haven rifle range was its first choice for a permanent site and the other authorizing the use of the Blakeslee-Grant property for a branch campus.[122] The president of the college, W. DeHomer Waller, stated that he was "deeply disappointed" but that the college should proceed to plan the East Haven campus.[123] In August, the Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Commission for Higher Education visited both the East Haven and the New Haven sites and held an open meeting to hear from all interested parties.[124] According to the local paper, over a dozen New Haven legislators, students and community leaders expressed "overwhelming" opposition to the proposal to move the college to East Haven.[125] The following month, the Commission for Higher Education exercised its veto power, rejecting both the East Haven site and the "satellite concept."[126] The reasons which the Commission offered were similar to those of New Haven community groups. The East Haven site was

not within easy access of the large proportion of the minority residents of New Haven who do not have cars. The "satellite concept" was unacceptable because the state would have to support two separate campuses; more seriously, the inner-city facility would have an entirely black student body while the suburban center would serve primarily white students.[127] On October 30, the Commission directed the Department of Public Works to readvertise for bids for the college.[128] Throughout the fall, however, the Department took no action.[129] In January, 1974, a suit was filed by three students at the college, supported by the local chapter of the NAACP, asking for an injunction prohibiting Paul Manafort from interfering in the process of selecting a college site.[130] On July 2, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges removed its conditional accreditation of South Central Community College.[131]

The chain of events outlined above appears to demonstrate that the Governor was able to interfere with the process of selecting a site by exerting pressure on both the Department of Public Works and the Board of Trustees. The Commission for Higher Education, dominated by appointees of the previous governor, seemed to be less vulnerable to political pressure. The issue of the site is critical to the college. Were the school to move to East Haven, it would almost certainly attract a very different clientele from that currently enrolled. At the

same time, it is clear from the reports of various observers that the college can not continue to function as a viable entity in its present location. The loss of regional accreditation has jeopardized federally funded programs at the college and made it even more marginal an institution.

The extent to which South Central can be considered a democratizing agent can be explored further through a more detailed study of the internal organization of the college, the composition of its faculty and students, the nature of the curriculum and the rates of attrition, graduation and transfer.

C. Internal Organization

It seems plausible to expect that the success with which a community college advances social equality depends significantly upon the commitment of both faculty and administration to that aim. At South Central, however, many observers have noted the lack of a common purpose and the absence of effective authority. Leadership is exercised neither by the faculty nor by the administration. One of the distinguishing characteristics of higher education is the degree of faculty autonomy, but the faculty at South Central do not participate in decisions affecting appointment, promotion or dismissal of other faculty members or in the design of curriculum or general program planning.[132] The Board of Trustees selects the president of each college and he in turn is responsible for appointing

other members of the administrative staff.[133] The faculty are appointed by the administration and the Board of Trustees. A member of the administration presides at most of the faculty meetings and decides which items should be placed on the agenda.[134] Shortly before the term began in September, 1971, the Board of Trustees removed the department heads.[135] The network of faculty committees which were established in their place are generally agreed to be "inoperative."[136] As a result, there is no effective mechanism through which the faculty can exert any influence over important decisions.[137]

In a formal sense, the pattern of organization at the college can thus be categorized as hierarchical. However, it is doubtful that the Board of Trustees and the college's administrative staff are really in control. The overriding problem at the college is the absence of rapport between administration and faculty. The internal tensions at the college were heightened when the president terminated the contracts of ten faculty members in December, 1971. A number of students and some members of the black community charged that these teachers had been singled out not because they were unqualified but because they tended to be sympathetic to the needs of minority students.[138] At the same time, all of the faculty began to fear that, since the procedures for evaluating the teaching staff were not being enforced, their own positions also might be in jeopardy.[139] The report of the regional accrediting

association remarked that "it would be difficult to cite any other institution within our experiences where morale is quite so low . . . this faculty is almost at a point of paranoia."[140]

It has been impossible for the school to develop a distinctive character or sense of purpose in the midst of the continual internal dissension. The report of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges concluded: "At the present time there is no assurance that this college can begin to work towards a common goal with any degree of unity and cooperation."[141] Founded without a well-defined aim, South Central has not succeeded in producing an organizational identity accepted by all sectors of the school's population. In turn, the absence of a sense of community and of effective leadership has left the college even more at the mercy of outside political forces.

D. Faculty

The relatively large number of part-time members of the teaching staff and the high turn-over of both the administration and faculty may have increased the difficulties of developing a cohesive and unified institution. Faculty members who come to the college to teach only one or two courses and who retain their positions no more than a few semesters lack a feeling of commitment to the school. The large percentage of part-time faculty members has been repeatedly criticized since the college opened.[142] In the

fall of 1969, the college employed 51 part-time teachers but only 24 full-time faculty members.[143] By the spring of 1972, the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty positions had been almost reversed. The teaching staff consisted of 42 full-time and 22 part-time faculty members.[144] Nevertheless, the regional accrediting association stated that there were still too many part-time teachers, and urged that they be replaced by full-time faculty.[145]

There has also been a lack of continuity in both the faculty and administration. Of the 13 chief administrative officers listed in a college report in October, 1969, seven were no longer at the college in April, 1972. A report issued in the spring of 1972 listed 15 members of the administration. Of the six who were on the administrative staff in 1969, at least two had changed their jobs. An additional administrator had been a member of the faculty in 1969. Eight administrative personnel, including the president and academic dean, were new to the college.[146] In fact, although the college has been in existence only six years, it has had three different presidents. The current president, Dr. W. De Homer Waller, took office in September 1971. The teaching staff has also experienced rapid turn-over. Of the 26 full-time faculty members in October, 1969, 16 had left the teaching staff by 1972. The "drop-out" rate of the 51 part-time faculty members was, as one might expect, even higher. By the spring of

1972, 35 were no longer at the college. Thus, 15 of the 22 part-time faculty members and 18 of the full-time members had come to the college between October 1969 and April 1972.[147] It will be seen that a high proportion of the student body leaves the college before completing two years' work. South Central is thus a college with a rapidly shifting population; only a small percentage of the administration, faculty or student body remains at the college for a significant length of time.

The absence of a well-defined goal at the college is reflected in the haphazard manner by which faculty members are recruited. Teachers have frequently been hired a few days before the beginning of term and some have not even been interviewed before receiving an appointment. It would be extremely unlikely that a faculty so selected would share a common ideal, such as social equality through education.

There is considerable controversy about the appropriate training and background for a faculty member at a community college. This may stem partly from the ambiguous position which community colleges occupy between secondary and higher education. In the United States, school teachers are clearly differentiated from college teachers. High school and elementary school teachers have traditionally had fewer academic credentials and received lower pay; as a result, their status has been lower. College and university faculty, considered scholars as well as teachers, are the elite of

the profession. One way for a community college to gain prestige in the academic hierarchy would be to hire university graduates with Ph.D.'s. However, many educators have pointed out that the traditional Ph.D. program, emphasizing research rather than teaching, is inappropriate for community college teachers. Instead, there should be teacher training programs specifically geared to the potential community college faculty.

The formal regulations for faculty at community colleges in Connecticut have been established by the Board of Trustees. These regulations differ from those at most community colleges in the country in that academic rank has been instituted and the doctorate, although not a prerequisite for advancement, is a useful credential.[148]

RANK AND MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR FACULTY
(10 Months' Position)

Rank	Degree and Years of Teaching or Appropriate Experience	
Professor	Doctorate	and 9 years
	Sixth Year or Equiv.	and 12 years
	Master's or Equiv.	and 15 years
Associate Professor	Doctorate	and 6 years
	Sixth Year or Equiv.	and 9 years
	Master's or Equiv.	and 12 years
Assistant Professor	Doctorate	and 2 years
	Sixth Year or Equiv.	and 4 years
	Master's or Equiv.	and 6 years
Instructor	Doctorate	
	Sixth Year or Equiv.	and 1 year
	Master's or Equiv.	and 2 years
Temporary Appointments		
Assistant Instructor	Bachelor's	
Lecturer	Bachelor's	

These regulations are wholly unrealistic for a community college. In fact, the M.A. is the highest degree held by almost all faculty members at South Central.[149] Because there is currently an over-abundance of doctorates and of qualified graduate students in many fields in the New Haven area, we can assume that the administration of the college has made a decision not to employ those whose credentials could enhance the status of the institution in the academic world. One result of the discrepancy between the formal regulations and the actual hiring practices at the college is that the great majority of the faculty members are employed at a relatively low rank.[150] As the regional accreditation association has pointed out, the college lacks the senior faculty members who might be able to provide leadership.[151]

It is also significant that a large proportion of the full-time faculty are former school teachers. Of the 26 full-time faculty members at the college in October, 1969, nineteen had previously taught below the college level.[152] Twenty-eight members of the full-time teaching staff in April 1972 had formerly taught at either an elementary or secondary school.[153] Because status in academia is determined by the academic credentials and previous experience of the faculty, the composition of South Central's teaching staff is a further element in the second-rate standing of the college.

E. Students

The principal means by which Connecticut's community colleges serve the goal of equality is through their policy of open enrollment: all high school graduates and all adults who lack a high school diploma but are considered sufficiently motivated and qualified can register at the colleges.[154] As a result, the nature of these institutions is determined to a large extent by the characteristics of their students. In this respect, community colleges differ from many post-secondary institutions. A community college is chosen by its clientele; it has no opportunity to recruit students who fulfill a predetermined image.[155] During the six years in which South Central Community College has been operating, both the size and the composition of its student body have changed significantly. Enrollment figures are in Table VI.

Although South Central was established in an area already served by seven post-secondary institutions, four of which offered an associate degree, the college did not originally have difficulty attracting a clientele. As the Arthur D. Little Company pointed out, "Community colleges tend to generate their own enrollment more than any other institution of higher education."[156] The college held a few courses in the summer of 1968 which were attended by a total of 61 students. When the college officially opened the following fall, it had 422 students. Enrollment grew rapidly through the fall of 1972, by which time the student

body had increased almost four-fold. The following year, however, enrollment dropped 14 percent. We have seen that South Central was not unique among Connecticut's community colleges in experiencing a declining enrollment during the early 1970's. However, the size of the decrease was more serious at South Central than at most of the other regional community colleges. It is of course impossible to demonstrate that the enrollment drop was caused by the declining reputation of the school. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that one effect of the precipitous fall in enrollment before the school was firmly institutionalized was that the college appeared even more marginal to the system of higher education. Moreover, in June, 1974, the Board of Trustees directed the president of South Central to terminate the contracts of ten of the 36 full-time faculty members because of declining enrollment. As a result, faculty morale dropped even lower and fears were expressed that the college would be forced to limit its already restricted course offerings.[157]

The changing composition of the student body is even more significant than the enrollment figures. The college opened with a freshman class which resembled the typical college population more than did the 1973 entering class. In the late 1960's, a large proportion of the students were men who had just graduated from high school and who enrolled on a full-time basis. At this time, college-age men could avoid the draft only if they attended college full-time. The end of the draft was a significant

factor in the dwindling enrollment of men just graduated from high school. The college-age male students have been replaced by housewives, Vietnam veterans and adults who are already employed but are seeking to upgrade their positions. During the past few years, the percentage of women, of part-time students and of "older" students has been rising.[158] In this respect, the college is gradually tending to serve more as a community resource.

The open admissions programs of the late 1960's were directed not only toward minority students (discussed above) but also toward students from low socio-economic backgrounds and students with poor academic records. Both of these latter groups constituted substantial proportions of the student body at South Central Community College, as at many inner-city colleges throughout the country, presenting problems similar to those associated with the high number of minority students. A college which enrolls students disadvantaged by reason of poverty or low scholastic achievement is promoting social equality by providing educational opportunities for groups which had previously been excluded from higher education. At the same time, the standing of the college in the academic world declines.

Unfortunately, the only available information about the income of South Central's student body has been obtained from the students' estimates of their parents' earnings and this source is notoriously unreliable. The information does suggest, however, that students from low income groups,

not traditionally served by higher education, constitute a far greater proportion at South Central than at the average community college. According to the Carnegie Commission, community college students "tend to come from families with average incomes."[159] However, a grant proposal submitted by South Central in 1972 stated that 28 percent of the students reported a parental income of less than $6,000 and 56 percent claimed that their parents earned under $10,000 each year.[160] During registration in September, 1973, the Director of Records conducted a survey of the student body. Of the 352 students who answered a question concerning the income of their parents before taxes, 143 said that their parents' earnings were under $7,500 and 152 claimed that their parents' income was between $7,500 and $15,000; 50 estimated that their parents earned between $15,000 and $30,000 and only seven reported a parental income of over $30,000. The Board of Trustees has provided information about the socio-economic status of students in all of Connecticut's community colleges. During the academic year 1972-73, 47 percent of the registered students had an annual family income of $12,000 or less and 16 percent had a family income of under $7,500. Twenty-four percent of the students classified their fathers' occupation as either unskilled or semi-skilled; only seven percent reported that their fathers had a profession requiring a B.A.[161]

According to K. P. Cross, "new students" in higher education are distinguished more by their low academic test scores than by any other measurement.[162] South Central

appears to contain a larger proportion of students with poor academic credentials than most community colleges. The Carnegie Commission has stated that the students at community colleges throughout the nation "tend to be almost equally divided between students of above-average and below-average ability."[163] However, over 70 percent of the students enrolled at South Central during the fall semesters of 1968 and 1969 and over 80 percent of the student body in the spring semester of 1972 were in the bottom half of their high school graduating class.[164] The grant proposal submitted in 1972 stated:[165]

> Economic disadvantages are not the only ones which affect our students. Their educational histories further clarify the situation. From a student population of 1550, 76 percent received grades in high school of "C" or lower. Sixty-four percent received grades of "C" or lower in their last high school math course. At least 55 percent needed help in reading comprehension and 39 percent needed help in study techniques. Thus, more than half of the student body has marked deficiences in the basic reading, writing and mathematics, skills that are traditionally considered prerequisites to success in college level work.

The Board of Trustees has written,

> The Connecticut Community Colleges have provided . . . opportunity to thousands of people in lower income levels, to members of minority groups and to other adults who would not otherwise have been served by the traditional institutions of public higher education, as well as thousands of more "typical" students.[166]

South Central has done this more extensively than the others, and indeed, calls itself "The People's College." But the college is also part of a system of education which functions as a mechanism for social distribution. A process

of negative selection in the elementary and secondary schools has determined the composition of the student body at South Central. Community colleges in Connecticut have not gained the respectability of those in California, where the great majority of the state's college-going residents begin their post-secondary education in a public two year college. In turn, the relatively high proportion of minority students, of students from low socio-economic backgrounds and of students with low scholastic achievement and college aptitude scores further diminishes the status of the school. Moreover, as both Clark and Karabel have pointed out, the important question is not whether groups in society which were previously excluded from higher education can gain admittance to a college but what happens to them once they enroll. Is the educational program relevant to their interests and needs? How many students drop out before completing a course of study? How many remain at the college and receive a degree? How many transfer to a four-year institution? In other words, to what extent does the college itself function primarily as a selection mechanism?

F. Curriculum

The open admissions policies of many colleges throughout the nation have been accompanied by intensive compensatory programs. The City University of New York has frequently been cited as an example of an institution

which, in this way, has attempted to reconcile the competing goals of democratization and academic excellence.[167] The college has assumed responsibility for the academic success of each student admitted through its open enrollment program, even while seeking to retain its traditionally high standards; instead of "cooling out" or more publicly flunking students who fail to meet these standards, the college has sought to provide poorly prepared students with the requisite skills for "college-level" work.

Shortly after South Central opened, the college obtained a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for an individual tutoring program for students who were considered to be disadvantaged by reason of poverty. However, in the fall of 1973, federal investigators warned that the college might lose the grant because the college had mismanaged the funds.[168] Faculty members have also complained that the program was improperly administered. Although the fate of the funding is still uncertain, the program has been greatly disrupted. The tensions and suspicions surrounding the college at the present time appear to have undermined a program which was critical to the academic success of many students.

Except for the absence of a technical curriculum, the other courses at the college are fairly typical of those at many community colleges throughout the country. The college offers a number of standard liberal arts and occupational courses. See Table VII. During the past

few years there has been a clear shift in student enrollment from the liberal arts to the general education program. The latter does not prepare students directly for transfer to a four-year institution and appears to be somewhat less rigorous; students need not fulfill a language requirement and they can earn more credits through "elective" courses.[169] It is also significant that the majority of male students who are registered in the occupational curricula are majoring in business while a significant proportion of women are enrolled in the child care program. Both programs have been emphasized at the college largely because they do not require the expensive equipment and elaborate laboratories of other vocational programs. The shape of the curriculum has thus been dictated by the level of funding and the physical facilities.

Since South Central is not composed largely of the white, middle-class, academically able, college-age youth for whom most college curricula are written, it would be interesting to know the extent to which the college has geared its courses to the needs and interests of its students. The college claims that effective instruction is its primary goal[170] and, according to the official regulations of the Board of Trustees, the performance of the teaching staff is regularly evaluated.[171] Faculty members, however, have stated that they are rarely evaluated.

In May, 1972 the regional accreditation association reported:

> There is a need for increased supervision of instruction and for constructive criticism of teaching to insure collegiate-level instruction. Methodologies utilizing instructional practices requiring recitation is [sic] hardly the most appropriate means for instructing adults. There is a void, at the present time, in the whole process of faculty evaluation. . . .
>
> The need for faculty in-service education including the reinforcement of junior college philosophy is most evident.[172]

G. Student Careers: Retention, Graduation and Transfer

The extent to which a college actually serves as an avenue of access to higher education may be measured by the number of students who remain at the college long enough to earn a degree and by the number who transfer to a four-year institution. Nevertheless, retention figures in particular are frequently misleading. It is frequently noted that attrition is a serious problem at community colleges throughout the nation; the "open-door" becomes, in effect, a "revolving door." But community college administrators have pointed out that the high drop out rate at public, non-selective, low cost two-year colleges means something different from what it would at traditional four-year institutions. Students frequently enroll at community colleges precisely because they lack the academic credentials and financial resources which would permit them to complete any other post-secondary course of study. Low socio-economic status and poor high school

records are characteristics which are frequently associated with high drop-out rates.[173] Moreover, many students register at the college without intending to complete an associate degree; they may want either to obtain a particular credit or to receive the information offered in a certain course. A large number of the older students have commitments which do not permit them to remain in continuous attendance at a college for two years. Then, too, some students who officially "drop out" return to school after an interval.[174] Since a community college has a far more heterogeneous student body than the typical four-year college, the motivations and plans of the students are extremely diverse. The withdrawal rate of a community college becomes meaningful only when we ascertain the original aspirations of the students.

It has been written that "most 'target' students for open enrollment programs are . . . at least as ambitious [as] traditional college entrants from more favorable socio-economic backgrounds."[175] A survey conducted by the Director of Records at South Central Community College in September 1973 bears this out. See Table VIII. Of the 853 students who had formulated their plans, 531 hoped to continue their education after graduation in order to obtain at least a B.A. The Dean of Students has estimated that 75 percent of the students who come to the college expect to transfer to a four-year institution, a proportion similar to that

found at many of the nation's community colleges.[176] However, as the following data will show, the discrepancy between the high educational aspirations of the students and their actual achievements is even greater at South Central than at most community colleges.

The high rate of academic failure was apparent during the college's first two years. Out of a total of 297 students who enrolled at the college in the fall of 1968 on a full-time basis, only 55 returned the following September with the status of sophomores.[177] In May, 1972, the regional accreditation association remarked on the "unusually high withdrawal rate being experienced at the institution. Over fifty percent of the entering freshmen have left by the end of the first year."[178]

Although more students have recently been graduating from South Central than before, they still constitute less than 15 percent of those who enter the institution.[179] See Table IX. The ease with which these graduates can transfer to four year colleges depends largely upon the policies of the receiving institutions, and these policies reflect, to some extent, the status which community colleges have attained in the academic community. Four-year institutions will be reluctant to accept graduates of community colleges if they believe that the latter provide a second-rate education. Connecticut state colleges did initially erect barriers to the entry of community college

graduates, in contrast to the "guaranteed admission" policy of other states. However, during the past few years, demand for places at the state colleges and at the university has diminished. Faced with a dwindling number of applicants, both institutions have had to lower their admissions standards and community college graduates have been able to transfer with greater ease. In December, 1972, the Board of Trustees of Connecticut's four state colleges agreed to admit all qualified graduates of the community colleges. Although the University of Connecticut did not formally approve the resolution, it has agreed to offer priority to applicants who have completed a transfer degree at a community college.[180] Nevertheless, community college graduates are not automatically accepted into either the college or program they select; moreover, they frequently experience difficulties in transfering their credits and in obtaining financial aid.[181]

The Dean of Students at South Central has estimated that about 30 percent of the graduates transfer to a four-year institution.[182] However, since less than 15 percent of all entrants ultimately receive an associate degree, no more than five percent reach the four-year colleges. We have noted that most students enroll at the college after having been "negatively" selected by their previous educational experiences. The difference between the large proportion of students who hope to continue their education

after graduating from the college (75 percent) and the tiny fraction who fulfill these aspirations (about five percent) suggests that this college also operates as a mechanism for sorting and categorizing students.

Information is not available concerning the large majority of students who either do not graduate from South Central, or graduate but then do not transfer to the upper level of a four-year institution. How many find immediate employment? What proportion of the students who are already employed when they enter the college are able to secure better employment as a result of their college experience? Are there any "intangible" rewards which accrue to students who attend classes at the college? In the absence of such data it would be premature to conclude that the college does not enhance the life chances of its students. Nevertheless, community colleges could foster social equality partly by providing students with access to higher education. Although South Central may act as a democratizing agent when it admits students who are disadvantaged by reason of race, poverty or academic preparation, the college clearly does not facilitate the entry of many of these students into the mainstream of higher education.

IV. CONCLUSION

South Central Community College can not be considered representative of the community colleges in Connecticut. Nevertheless, this campus is significant precisely because it fulfills the worst fears of groups which have traditionally been denied admission to the established public colleges and universities. The high turnover of the faculty, administration and students, the tensions between these various groups and the absence of effective leadership have prevented the college from developing into a cohesive whole. As a result, the school has become even more vulnerable to outside political forces. It is difficult to discern any clear sense of purpose. In theory a college with a student body containing racial minorities, many students from low socio-economic backgrounds and many with poor academic records, could serve to foster equal opportunity in education. South Central, however, has failed to achieve this goal.

Table I[183]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Enrollment in Connecticut's Community Colleges, Fall 1972,
Showing Minority Representation

Community Colleges	Full-Time			Part-time				
	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	% Minority	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	% Minority	Total Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment
Greater Hartford	305	876	.35	261	650	.40	566	1,526
Housatonic	165	1,283	.13	154	1,130	.14	319	2,413
Manchester	64	1,976	.03	25	1,405	.01	89	3,381
Mattatuck	102	1,378	.07	44	853	.05	146	2,231
Middlesex	54	728	.07	68	887	.08	122	1,615
Mohegan	36	599	.06	95	497	.19	131	1,096
North Central	2	46	.04	--	191	.00	2	237
Northwestern	20	937	.02	4	693	.01	24	1,630
Norwalk	205	1,243	.16	239	1,626	.15	444	2,869
Quinebaug Valley	3	135	.02	1	234	.01	4	369
South Central	263	858	.31	215	785	.27	478	1,633
Tunxis	74	811	.09	41	954	.04	115	1,765
sub-total	1,293	10,870	.12	1,147	9,905	.12	2,440	20,775

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table II[184]

Undergraduate Enrollment in Public Four-Year Post-Secondary Institutions, Fall, 1972, Showing Minority Representation

	Full-time			Part-time		
	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	% Minority	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	% Minority
University of Connecticut (not incl. branches)	456	9,091	.05	6	157	.04
State Colleges						
Central	178	7,067	.03	138	2,707	.05
Eastern	77	2,053	.04	62	1,194	.05
Southern	177	7,117	.03	19	598	.03
Western	74	2,650	.04	219	4,499	.05
sub-total	506	18,887	.03			

Table III[185]

Black and Spanish Surname Residents
in Connecticut's Cities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Town	Aggregate Minority Population	Percentage of Total Population
Hartford	158,017	29
Bridgeport	156,542	17
New Haven	137,707	27
Stamford	108,798	13
Waterbury	108,033	11
Norwalk	79,113	12
New London	31,630	13
Bloomfield	18,301	14

Table IV[186]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Administration in Connecticut's System of Higher Education, Fall, 1972, Showing Minority Representation

	Minority	Total Administrative Employees	% Minority
University of Connecticut (incl. Health Center)	20	223	.09
State Colleges (excluding Southern Conn. for which no figures were reported)	10	132	.08
Regional Community Colleges:			
Greater Hartford	2	13	.09
Housatonic	0	22	.00
Manchester	2	30	.07
Mattatuck	1	24	.04
Middlesex	1	19	.05
Mohegan	2	12	.02
North Central	0	4	.00
Northwestern	0	15	.00
Norwalk	2	21	.10
Quinebaug Valley	0	7	.00
South Central	11	28	.39
Tunxis	0	13	.00
Sub-total	21	208	.10
State Technical Colleges	0	26	.00
Total Public	51	589	.09

Table V[187]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Full-Time Faculty in Connecticut's System of Higher Education, Fall, 1972, Showing Minority Representation

	Minority	Total Full-Time Faculty	% Minority
University of Connecticut (incl. Health Center)	39	1,311	.03
State Colleges	59	1,207	.05
Regional Community Colleges:			
Greater Hartford	3	50	.06
Housatonic	3	62	.05
Manchester	1	79	.01
Mattatuck	2	52	.04
Middlesex	0	45	.00
Mohegan	0	26	.00
North Central	0	4	.00
Northwestern	3	50	.06
Norwalk	5	76	.07
Quinebaug	0	6	.00
South Central	11	43	.26
Tunxis	0	18	.00
Sub-total	28	511	.05
State Technical Colleges	2	158	.01
Total Public	128	3,187	.04

Table VI[188]

Growth of Enrollment at South Central Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Enrollment		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
Fall 1968	297	125	422
Spring 1969	358	211	569
Fall 1969	734	189	923
Spring 1970	628	248	876
Fall 1970	952	397	1,349
Spring 1971	855	378	1,233
Fall 1971	1,025	504	1,529
Spring 1972	880	559	1,439
Fall 1972	858	785	1,643
Spring 1973	690	589	1,279
Fall 1973	642	755	1,397
Summer 1968			61
Summer 1969			193
Summer 1970			310
Summer 1971			393
Summer 1972			401
Summer 1973			480

Table VII[189]

Enrollment by Program at
South Central Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fall, 1971

Curriculum	Full-time Male	Full-time Female	Part-time Male	Part-time Female
Business	158	26	56	32
Accounting	25	4	5	6
Secretarial	--	32	--	26
Food Services	7	5	2	4
Child Care	25	124	7	78
Arts and Sciences Transfer	339	194	114	114
General Education	54	32	24	35
Total	608	417	209	295

Fall, 1972

Curriculum	Full-time Male	Full-time Female	Part-time Male	Part-time Female
Business	98	15	78	34
Accounting	11	5	8	5
Secretarial	--	31	--	32
Data Processing	12	8	5	6
Radiology	3	37	2	9
Radio/Therapy	1	7	--	3
Food	8	3	4	8
Child Care	4	93	8	120
Human Services	7	10	4	14
Arts and Sciences Transfer	136	97	68	111
General Education	169	103	109	156
Total	449	409	287	498

Fall, 1973

Curriculum	Full-time Male	Full-time Female	Part-time Male	Part-time Female
Business	94	13	69	22
Accounting	13	4	4	11
Secretarial	--	25	1	42
Data Processing	22	8	12	3
Radiology	9	51	2	9
Radio/Therapy	2	9	--	3
Food	7	8	5	8
Child Care	4	64	5	100
Human Services	9	19	6	10
Arts and Sciences Transfer	97	59	49	77
General Education	138	94	88	122
Total	395	247	348	407

Table VIII[198]

Student Aspirations
South Central Community College
Fall, 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student answers to question: "What is the highest level of education you plan to complete?"

Answer	Number of students
A one-year program	20
A two-year program of special training (nursing, laboratory technician, etc.)	221
A two-year Liberal Arts Degree	81
Bachelor's Degree (B.A., B.S.)	302
Master's Degree (M.A., M.S.)	179
Doctor's Degree or other professional degree (Ph.D., M.D., etc.)	50
Undecided	373
Total	1,226

Table IX[191]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Graduates of South Central Community College

June, 1970:	
Associate in Arts	12
Associate in Science	28
Total	40
June, 1971:	
Associate in Arts	0
Associate in Science	98
Total	98
June, 1972:	
Associate in Arts	16
Associate in Science	137
Total	153
June, 1973	
Associate in Arts	21
Associate in Science	192
Total	213

FOOTNOTES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Trow, Martin, "Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education," Conference on Future Structures of Post-Secondary Education, 26 - 29 June, 1973, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (DAS/EID/73.37), 8, 38.
2. "Planning of New Structures of Post-Secondary Education, Country Statement, United States of America," Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (DAS/EID/70.24/07), 13.
3. Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Preliminary Draft of Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, 1974-79, Document 17 (Hartford, 1973), IV, 1.
4. Medsker, Leland and John Beckham, "Control of Two-Year Colleges in the United States," Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (DAS/EID/71.40), 3.
5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. (McGraw-Hill, 1970), 3, 52.
6. Furth, Dorotea, "Short-Cycle Higher Education: Some Basic Considerations," Short-Cycle Higher Education: A Search for Identity, (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1973), 38.

7. Clark, Burton R., "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education," The American Journal of Sociology (Vol. LXV, No. 6, May 1960), 569-576.

8. Karabel, Jerome, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," Harvard Educational Review (Vol. 42, No. 4, Nov. 1972), 521-562.

9. Report of Task Force I to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Needs: Socio-Economic, Manpower, Regional (Hartford, 1970), 11.

10. Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, 1974-1979 (Hartford, 1974), 38.

11. Op. cit., iii.

12. Willingham, Warren W., Free-Access Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), 203.

13. Enrollment, The Report of Resource Group II. A Discussion Paper for the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut. Document #10 (Hartford, 1973), 10.

14. Willingham, Free Access, 203.

15. Op. cit., 60, 203-04.

16. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, IV, 3.

17. Op. cit., IV, 3.

18. Op. cit., IV, 2.

19. Berdahl, Robert O., Statewide Planning and Coordination (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971), 29.
20. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, IV, 3.
21. Op. cit., IV, 4.
22. Op. cit., IV, 4.
23. Enrollment, 5.
24. Master Plan for Higher Education, 39.
25. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, II, 2.
26. Report of Task Force I, 70.
27. Op. cit., 67; Report of Task Force IV to the Commission for Higher Education: Qualitative and Quantitative Performance and Achievement in Higher Education (Hartford, 1971), 50.
28. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan III, 10.
29. Report of Task Force I, 69.
30. Op. cit., 22.
31. Op. cit., 67.
32. Carnegie, Open-Door Colleges, 25.
33. Master Plan for Higher Education, 31; Goals, 46.
34. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, III, 11.
35. Goals, The Report of Resource Group I, A Discussion Paper for the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, Document #9 (Hartford, 1973), 69.

Nevertheless, the technical colleges still occupy a somewhat ambiguous position between secondary and

higher education; their governing board is composed of members of the State Board of Education, which also has some responsibility for overseeing elementary and secondary education.

36. Arthur D. Little, Inc., A Suggested Plan for Developing Connecticut's Regional Community College System: Report to the State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges (1970), 67.

37. Hartford Courant, 12-13-67; State Technical College Administrative Council, "Recommendations and Commentary: Master Planning for Higher Education in Connecticut" (July 1973), 12.

38. Arthur D. Little, Suggested Plan, 27.

39. Op. cit., 50; Report of Task Force I, 22.

40. State Technical College Administrative Council, "Recommendations."

41. The college authorized for the Ansonia-Bridgeport-Derby region has not yet been constructed.

42. Report of Task Force III to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education: Financing Higher Education (Hartford, 1970), 2.

43. Ferrin, Richard I., A Decade of Change in Free-Access Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), 31.

44. Willingham, Free Access, 60.

45. Op. cit., 60. The level of access is determined by tuition and admissions standards. The term "free access" includes both free, open-door colleges and institutions which are slightly more expensive and selective.

46. Op. cit., 60, 55, 195. Willingham considered a person to be living within commuting distance of a college if his door-to-door commuting time was no more than 45 minutes.

47. Enrollment, 5.

48. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, V, 11.

49. Enrollment, 6.

50. Ibid.

51. According to projections of the Commission for Higher Education, full-time equivalent enrollment will be distributed as follows:

University of Connecticut	24,000
State Colleges	24,500
Community Colleges	25,000

(Enrollment, 7).

52. Enrollment, 7

53. Charles, Searle F., Executive Officer, Regional Community Colleges, "Priorities" (March 5, 1971), 2.

54. Total enrollment in many community colleges in California ranges up to 20,000. By comparison, those in Connecticut are very small.

55. Enrollment, 2, 13.

56. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan II, 6; Table X, 2, 3.
57. Op. cit., IV, 4.
58. Master Plan for Higher Education, 110; The Commission for Higher Education, "Re-accreditation of South Central Community College, New Haven, Connecticut" (June 16, 1972), 18.
59. Karabel, "Community Colleges," 552.
60. Master Plan for Higher Education, 113.
61. No explanation was provided of how these states were selected.
62. Master Plan for Higher Education, 113.
63. Op. cit., 66.
64. Board of Trustees for Community Colleges, "Facilities Status Report" (1971).
65. Ferrin, Decade of Change, 5.
66. Enrollment, 2; Equal Opportunity, The Report of Resource Group VII, A Discussion Paper for the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, Document #15 (Hartford, 1973), 35, 42, 47; Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, IX, 2; II, 3.
67. It should be remembered, however, that many of the private institutions recruit students outside of Connecticut; in 1968, less than one half of the students enrolled in private four-year colleges and universities were residents of Connecticut. (Arthur D. Little, Suggested Plan, 8).

68. Equal Opportunity, 63.

69. Op. cit., 3, 35, 63.

70. Report of Task Force I, 9.

71. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, Table IX, 2.

72. Goals, 119.

73. Equal Opportunity, 64.

74. Op. cit., 63.

75. Op. cit., 70, 72.

76. Figures compiled by Director of Records, South Central Community College.

77. Equal Opportunity, 49.

78. Ibid.

79. From a source which wishes to remain anonymous. This comment is similar to the frequently quoted statement of a former president of the University of California:

> Without the excellent junior colleges that have been developed, [the University of California] would hardly have been able to establish and maintain its present high standards of admission and graduation, as would also have been true had there been no state colleges. Certainly class size could not have been held to a reasonable level, nor could the need for land and buildings have been kept within bounds.

(Quoted in Clark, Burton, The Open Door College: A Case Study [New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960], 167)

80. Equal Opportunity, 51.

81. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, IX, 2.

82. Equal Opportunity, 78.

83 Op. cit., 76.

84. Medsker, Leland and Dale Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), 106.

85. Master Plan for Higher Education, viii.

86. Medsker and Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers, 114, 116.

87. Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges, "Regional Advisory Councils for Connecticut's Community Colleges," (1971).

88. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, III, 7, 8, 21; VI, 1-4, 7, 10.

89. Equal Opportunity, 45.

90. New Haven Register, 11-11-73.

91. Equal Opportunity, 26-7.

92. South Central Community College, "Replies to Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Connecticut Colleges or Universities" (October, 1969), 9.

93. Journal-Courier, 1-18-74.

94. Commissions on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Visit to South Central Community College," (May 10, 1972), 10.

95. Martorana, S. V., "Community-Junior Colleges in the United States," in Furth, Short-Cycle Higher Education, 127.

96. Arthur D. Little, Suggested Plan, 34.

97. Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges, "Facilities Status Report" (October, 1971).

98. Commission for Higher Education, "Re-Accreditation of South Central Community College" (June 16, 1972), 19.

99. Journal-Courier, 7-23-73; 3-7-74.

100. New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, "Visit to South Central," 4.

101. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, V, 13-14.

102. South Central Community College, "A Position Paper Related to the Steps Taken to Select a Site for South Central Community College," (August 14, 1973), 3.

103. Op. cit., 3.

104. Journal-Courier, 9-3-72; 9-29-72.

105. "Position Paper," 3.

106. Journal-Courier, 3-20-73; 3-22-73; 3-26-73; 4-10-73; 4-12-73; New Haven Register, 1-14-73.

107. Journal-Courier, 3-20-73. A number of studies have demonstrated the close relationship between proximity to a community college and attendance. For example, according to a study conducted in Chicago in 1964, students who lived within a one mile radius of a community college were three times more likely to enroll than those whose home was 2-1/2 miles away. (Willinghan, Free Access, 16-17.)

108. Journal-Courier, 4-11-73.
109. Op. cit., 4-11-73; 4-12-73; 4-17-73; 5-10-73; 8-7-73.
110. Op. cit., 2-5-73; 3-26-73.
111. Op. cit., 3-20-73; 4-10-73.
112. Op. cit., 2-5-73; 4-11-73; 5-10-73; 7-20-73.
113. "Position Paper," 3.
114. Journal-Courier, 3-20-73.
115. Op. cit., 5-18-73; 10-31-73; Register, 9-18-73.
116. Journal-Courier, 4-11-73.
117. Op. cit., 5-10-73.
118. "Position Paper," 3.
119. Journal-Courier, 5-22-73.
120. Op. cit., 5-13-73; 5-23-73; "Position Paper," 6.
121. "Position Paper," 3.
122. Op. cit., 4.
123. South Central Community College, "Press Release," 6-19-73.
124. "Position Paper," 4.
125. Register, 8-7-73.
126. Journal-Courier, 9-12-73; 9-13-73; 9-14-73.
127. Op. cit., 9-12-73.
128. Op. cit., 1-23-74.
129. Op. cit., 12-13-73; 2-27-74.
130. Op. cit., 1-23-74.

131. Letter from Kathryn A. McCarthy, Chairman, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, to W. D. Waller, President, South Central Community College, July 2, 1974. The action by the regional accrediting association was acknowledged by state officials to be a "drastic step." (Journal-Courier, 7-3-74) According to one member of the New England Association, no college had lost its accreditation during the five years he had served with it. (Journal-Courier, 7-4-74) The school can still operate, for state licensure was renewed conditionally for another year. (Journal-Courier, 7-9-64) However, students who wish to transfer to a four-year institution outside the state will face increased difficulties and the college may become ineligible for federal funding.

132. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 8; Commission for Higher Education, "Re-Accreditation," 13.

133. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 2.

134. Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, "Interim Visit in Regard to Institutional Accreditation of South Central Community College, New Haven, Connecticut," (October 29, 1973), 6.

135. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 2.

136. Op. cit., 3, 8; Commission for Higher Education, "Interim Visit," 5.

137. Commission for Higher Education, "Interim Visit," 6; Commission for Higher Education, "Re-Accreditation," 13; New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 8.

138. Journal-Courier, 6-1-72.

139. Commission for Higher Education, "Re-Accreditation," 6; New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 6.

140. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 7.

141. Op. cit., 11.

142. South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 9.

143. Ibid.

144. South Central Community College, "Information for Evaluation of the South Central Community College, Prepared for Presentation to the Evaluation Committee" (April 18, 1972), 21-88.

145. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 7.

146. South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 6-8; South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 4-5.

147. South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 21-88; South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 16-27.

148. Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges, Personnel Policies for the Professional Employees of the Regional Community College System (adopted November 16, 1970), D 3.

149. In October, 1969, 23 full-time faculty members had an M.A., one had a B.A., one a J.D. and one, who also served as a member of the administration, a doctorate in education. (South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 16-19). In April, 1972, 37 full-time faculty members had an M.A., three a B.A., one a J.D. and one reported that he held a Ph.D. from Rome. (South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 21-66.)

150. Of the 42 full-time faculty members in the spring of 1972, 31 were instructors, four were lecturers and seven were assistant professors. All of the 22 part-time faculty members had the rank of instructor. (South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 21-88).

151. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 6.

152. South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 16-19.

153. South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 21-66.

154. However, students who wish to enter certain programs, such as allied health sciences, must be selected on the basis of their general aptitude and previous preparation. (Report of Task Force I, 22.)

155. Clark, The Open Door College, 41, 138, 147-149.

156. Arthur D. Little, Suggested Plan, 87.

157. Faculty, South Central Community College, "Resolution," June, 1974; Journal-Courier, 5-27-74; 6-4-74.

158. Personal communications, Dean of Students and Director of Records, South Central Community College.

159. Carnegie, Open-Door Colleges, 3.

160. South Central Community College, "An Individualized Approach to Liberal Studies, A Proposal Submitted to the Commissioner of Education for Student Special Services Programs in the Division of Student Assistance" (February 15, 1972), 1. Because the college was seeking to obtain federal funds for a program for disadvantaged students, it is at least possible that the college overstated its case.

161. Board of Trustees, "Connecticut Community Colleges, 1973-74."

162. Cross, K. P., Beyond the Open Door (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971), 13-14.

163. Carnegie, Open-Door Colleges, 3.

164. South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 16; South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 12.

165. A Proposal Submitted to the Commissioner of Education for the Student Special Services Programs.

166. "Connecticut Community Colleges, 1973-74."

167. Hollander, T. Edward, "A Further Look into CUNY's Open Enrollment," in Wilson, Logan and Olive Mills, eds., Universal Higher Education: Costs, Benefits, Options (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972), 257; Jaffe, A. J. and Walter Adams, "Two Models of Open Enrollment" in Wilson and Mills, Higher Education, 238; Karabel, Jerome, "Perspectives on Open Admissions" in Wilson and Mills, Higher Education, 277.

168. Journal-Courier, 2-11-74.

169. South Central Community College, 1973-74 Catalog.

170. South Central, "Information for Evaluation," 1.

171. Personnel Policies, B3-B12.

172. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 6.

173. Larvin, David E. and Richard Silberstein, "Student Retention under Open Admissions at the City University of New York: September 1970 Enrollees Followed Through Four Semesters"(New York: Office of Program and Policy Research, City University of New York, 1974), 7, 11.

174. The proportion of "drop-outs" who eventually return is of course critical. The counseling department at South Central claims that 49 percent of the students who withdraw plan to continue their education at the college. (South Central Community College, "Attrition Study" [May 1973], 6). However, the department obtained this figure by phoning recent drop-outs and asking if they planned to return to the college; it is likely that many students who had no intention of returning nevertheless responded affirmatively when questioned by a college administrator.

175. Jaffe and Adams, "Two Models of Open Enrollment," 250.

176. Personal communication; Karabel, "Community Colleges," 227.

177. South Central, "Replies to Questionnaire," 11.

178. New England Association, "Visit to South Central," 3. The proportion is comparable for minority students. ("Attrition Study," 8). Investigators of the open admissions policy at the City University of New York found that Black and Puerto Rican students were more likely than white students to withdraw before completing a degree. (Jaffe and Adams, "Two Models of Open Enrollment," 239.)

179. It is significant that the number of students receiving the Associate in Arts degree has remained fairly constant. This degree can be obtained only upon completion of the liberal arts program. (South Central Community College, 1973-74 Catalog.) Since a large number of students still enroll in this program, we can assume that many transfer into less rigorous programs during their progress through the college.

180. Master Plan for Higher Education, 87-88.

181. Op. cit., 89.

182. Personal communication.

183. Equal Opportunity, 70, 72.

184. Ibid.

185. Preliminary Draft of Master Plan, Table IX, 2.

186. Equal Opportunity, 78.

187. Op. cit., 76.

188. Figures compiled by Director of Records, South Central.

189. Op. cit.

190. Survey conducted by Director of Records, South Central.

191. Figures compiled by Director of Records, South Central.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION